

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 6, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 6, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 remain pending following entry of this response. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 15-19 to be directed to a computer readable storage medium. Applicants submit that, as amended, claims 15-19 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Young* (U.S. 6,560,606).

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Young* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim." For example, *Young* does not disclose a method for invoking a plurality of functional modules configured to process a query result retrieved from a database from within an application that includes providing a configuration file containing information

regarding invocation of the functional modules, where the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules, as recited by claim 1. Claims 11, 15, and 20 recite similar limitations.

Young is directed to “telecommunication systems, and more particularly to computer processing of metered information.” *Young* 1:8-10. More simply, *Young* is directed to techniques for billing customers for using different telecommunication services. The material cited by the Examiner is directed to processing performed “pipeline stage” used to process an “input queue.” The pipeline itself, it is part of “a metered data processing system 104 for processing the metered data to generate useful information regarding communication services usage.” *Young*, 4:53-55. That is, the pipeline generates information used to calculate a customer bill. Depending on what services a consumer subscribes to or consumes, the method for calculating a bill for a metered service may vary. To address this issue, *Young* discloses the use of a staged pipeline to process metering data:

The pipeline 130 processes the metered session through a sequence of steps or stages that transform the metered data contents of the session objects into the processed usage data, which are stored in memory 135. The processed usage data can include a subset of the metered properties of the metered data along with additional properties that are synthesized from the metered properties. The pipeline 130 can aggregate metered data from related or unrelated transactions. The aggregated data can then be incorporated in reports or in calculations based on aggregate usage of a product, such as, for example, monthly service plans.

Young, 5:599-67 – 6:1-2. Clearly, however, the techniques of processing metering information to calculate a customer bill fails to disclose a method for invoking a plurality of functional modules configured to process a query result retrieved from a database that includes providing a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional modules, wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules. *Young* also fails to teach the foregoing method where the method also includes receiving the query result

retrieved from the database, invoking the plurality of functional modules to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file, and returning the processed query result to the application. Instead, *Young* discloses processing metering data using a staged pipeline to calculate a customer's billed charges.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Young* (U.S. Patent 6,560,606) as applied to claims 1-20, and 22-26 and in view of *Manolis et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,583,799).

Claim 21 depends from independent claim 20 and is, therefore, believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)